

Date: Mon, 27 Dec 93 04:30:25 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #551
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 27 Dec 93 Volume 93 : Issue 551

Today's Topics:

 cb dx activity
 code speed
 cw speed
 Let's all get together (code/nocode debates...)
 License reform (was Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?
 Looking for a copy of Part 97

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 27 Dec 1993 11:51:34 GMT
From: usc.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!pipex!zaphod.crihan.fr!jussieu.fr!univ-
lyon1.fr!elendir@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: cb dx activity
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

bill nelson (billn@hpcvaac.cv.hp.com) wrote:

: : Do you mean that in the USA, the questions are known in advance ?
: Not only the questions, but the proper answer.

Well, it's hardly believable. Over here, questions are not known (The pool
is not published, although you may pass fake tests with questions like the
ones asked) nor are the answers, of course.

In fact, everything is done on a computer terminal.

A system like yours seems to me a bit... weird.

73, Vince.

--

Date: Sun, 26 DEC 93 18:02:37 EST
From: noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
Subject: code speed
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

'We're still cutting them off from a major part of traditional amateur radio by denying them HF access...'

Which is the FCC's fault.

'...and by scorning them as "not real amateurs".'

Which is the fault of the likes of Robert, not to mention WA4D.

-- Ed Ellers, KD4AWQ

Date: 26 Dec 1993 12:22:27 -0800
From: swrinde!sgiblab!sgigate.sgi.com!olivea!apple.com!apple.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: cw speed
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

oo7@astro.as.utexas.edu (Derek Wills) writes:

>Incidentally, if the code is the thing that is holding everyone back,
>why are there so many General class hams, when they could easily take
>the Advanced level exams and upgrade without having to take a code
>test? They can't all be people who made it to General only recently
>and are in transit to Advanced, since in many cases their licenses go
>back several years.

Damn! I am arguing on the *opposite* side of Derek. Must be Christmas!

Look, take an insurance salesman (if I have to insult some group of people, I might as well pick one that there are least objections to :-) for whom the dit-dahs are easy patterns to follow, but who thinks of voltages and currents the way it was drawn in old ARRL manuals as a tank of water with different water levels and outlet

sizes. This bugger is not about to pass a written exam that questions you on the impedance of a quarter wave line that is shorted at the other end (short[sic] of memorising it, that is).

So, said insurance agent does not get his Advanced license. But, guess what? He gets to go on HF, anyway. No one is insisting that he puts in effort to pass his Advanced to gain access to HF. Afterall, he doesn't care. A few kc/s here and there of lost privileges. Goes out and buy his Kenwood and ready-cut inverted Vee and start talking with Peter I Is. Oh boy, this guy sure put in a lot of sweat to work HF!

Now take an EE nerd who is tone deaf. Can't do a dit-dah worth a damn, however much she tries, but she expects the Novice written to include questions on Brewster angle. Trouble is, she can't pass Morse test. Ergo, no HF access.

What a fair system!

Who is the lazy one?

Who would you rather let in to advance the state of the art of Amateur Radio? (I say let in both.)

I know, I know. Radio Amateurs are fat and happy with CW. Why do we need to advance it? Afterall, lots of people get 325 confirmed countries just ditting and dahing away in the same mode your grandfather used to use.

Happy 1994, everyone.

Kok Chen, AA6TY kchen@apple.com
Apple Computer, Inc.

Date: Sun, 26 DEC 93 18:04:31 EST
From: noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Let's all get together (code/nocode debates...)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

"The ITU treaty requires code profeciency (sic) for hams on the HF air wave."

Unless the administration concerned (in our case the FCC) notifies the ITU that it chooses to opt out of that provision. This has been explained before, and shouldn't need to be explained again.

-- Ed Ellers, KD4AWQ

Date: Mon, 27 Dec 1993 06:47:07 GMT
From: swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!uuneo!sugar!rcoyle@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: License reform (was Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2fltpf\$fo9@bigblue.oit.unc.edu>, cheech@med.unc.edu (Greg Young) writes:

> In article <1993Dec23.213231.22942@cs.brown.edu>,
> Michael P. Deignan <md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu> wrote:
> >
> >Certainly, I don't see why we should "dumb down" the tests as to make
> >them easier. On the other hand, to make the plan politically saleable
> >we may have to accomodate cries of "what about the kids!?!?" even though
> >I've always said that people under the age of 16 are more likely to get
> >involved with ham radio because dad is, not because they themselves found
> >the hobby and took an interest in it.
>
> Quite true, but it's also easier to get your hands on equipment is Dad is
> a ham. If it's not his equipment to begin with, he is less inclined to
> look at radios as just another expensive toy.

Actually, my dad got involved with ham radio because of MY interest in the hobby. His call is N5PKP (Technician, long before there was such a thing as a "Codeless Technician").

--Robert

--

Date: 16 Dec 93 04:38:32 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!usenet.ucs.indiana.edu!nickel.ucs.indiana.edu!dbasinge@uchvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: Looking for a copy of Part 97
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Is there a electronic copy of Part 97 Title 47 aviliable via ftp?

mike

--

D. Michael Basinger: Not speaking for Indiana University
dbasinge@nickel.ucs.indiana.edu
dbasinge@arapahoe.ucs.indiana.edu (NeXT Mail)

Date: Sun, 26 Dec 1993 19:18:53 GMT
From: swrinde!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <931222.06000.EDELLERS@delphi.com>,
<1993Dec25.145937.1535@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <CIM65D.Dwp@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

In article <CIM65D.Dwp@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> rcoyle@NeoSoft.com (Robert Coyle) writes:
>In article <1993Dec25.145937.1535@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:
>> In article <CIL6Mz.2Cu@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> rcoyle@NeoSoft.com (Robert Coyle) writes:
>> >It's the "wefare state mentality" of which you speak that I so strongly
>> >object to, Ed. You seem to think that the FCC OWES you HF access, without
>> >you doing a damn thing to earn it (and no, I don't count memorizing a
>> >question pool earning it). You can talk about it until you're blue in the
>> >face, but there's no way to justify laziness.
>>
>> Ah, but *you* on the other hand want the license handed to you for
>> memorizing 26 simple mechanical sounds, plus some numbers and
>> punctuation. You insist that memorizing over 400 theory questions
>> is easy, yet insist on a test of simple sonic recall. Who's lazy?
>
>If this is so, Gary, why do so many Codeless Technicians whine, complain,
>and bitch about learning Morse? Simple. The "test of simple sonic recall"
>requires EFFORT, and those who are too fucking lazy to do this demand that
>this element be abolished, and the gates to HF to be opened wide for them.

Digging holes and filling them back in again requires EFFORT too Robert, but what may be suitable for the punishment barracks at Leavenworth isn't necessarily a suitable use of time for radio amateur candidates. There's a world of difference between *productive* effort, like learning useful theory and regulatory matters that have application for all RF modes, and mere hazing by the spark brigade.

Gary

--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

Date: Sun, 26 Dec 1993 22:08:13 GMT
From: swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!uuneo!sugar!rcoyle@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <931220.05633.EDELLERS@delphi.com>, <931222.06000.EDELLERS@delphi.com>,
<1993Dec26.191853.7323@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Subject : Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

In article <1993Dec26.191853.7323@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

> In article <CIM65D.Dwp@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> rcoyle@NeoSoft.com (Robert Coyle) writes:

> >If this is so, Gary, why do so many Codeless Technicians whine, complain,
> >and bitch about learning Morse? Simple. The "test of simple sonic recall"
> >requires EFFORT, and those who are too fucking lazy to do this demand that
> >this element be abolished, and the gates to HF to be opened wide for them.
>

> Digging holes and filling them back in again requires EFFORT too Robert,
> but what may be suitable for the punishment barracks at Leavenworth isn't
> necessarily a suitable use of time for radio amateur candidates. There's
> a world of difference between *productive* effort, like learning useful
> theory and regulatory matters that have application for all RF modes, and
> mere hazing by the spark brigade.

Hazing? Now come on, Gary, you can't be serious! It's not called hazing, it's called LEARNING. CW is in wide use on the HF bands, and FCC has set aside portions of each band for that mode, and those who are serious should either learn it, abide by the licensing regulations as set forth by Part 97, or go out and find another hobby where they don't have to demonstrate effort. As for "learning useful theory and regulatory matters," memorizing a question pool demonstrates little, other than knowing which questions go with which answers. I challenge you to show me who this is "advancing the state of the radio art," as defined by 97.1.

--Robert

--

Date: 27 Dec 1993 06:19:26 GMT
From: library.ucla.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!concert!
bigblue.oit.unc.edu!cheech@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Dec22.015119.21144@anomaly.sbs.com>,
<2facfk\$41dr@bigblue.oit.unc.edu>, <1993Dec23.175555.23762@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Subject : Re: License reform (was Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

In article <1993Dec23.175555.23762@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
Gary Coffman <gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> wrote:

>
>Well pardon me, but I think that allowing very young children
>to supervise 250 watt (current Novice) or 1.5 kW transmitters
>(currently everyone else) isn't such a hot idea in the first
>place.

You're pardoned. Since this would be designed for kids power restrictions would be perfectly reasonable. I would be inclined toward a 100 watt power limit, and could easily be convinced that a lower limit is needed. This is not designed as a contesting license.

>Two things, *all* amateurs are supposed to learn by doing *all* their
>lives*. That's what self training is all about. Second, yes computers
>are attractive, and so are cars and guns, but we don't let very young
>children operate potentially hazardous machinery unsupervised. We
>expect them to have reached a certain level of maturity first. Now
>I don't think fixed age limits are the right answer, some children
>mature faster than others, but I do think that, if they can't pass
>an exam demonstrating basic competence in electrical safety, rules
>and regulations, and a bit of simple radio theory, they shouldn't
>be allowed near a transmitter without being supervised by a competent
>licensee.

This is much like I imagine a class C license exam would look, heavy emphasis on basic safety and operating rules with simple radio theory included as necessary to allow operation within those rules. It may be that we have different definitions of simple radio theory.

Greg Young AC4YT
cheech@med.unc.edu

Date: 27 Dec 1993 06:23:46 GMT
From: usc.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!
concert!bigblue.oit.unc.edu!cheech@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <gganderson.207.0@augustana.edu>,
<1993Dec23.174015.23679@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <2ffa8rINN540@abyss.west.sun.com>t.u
Subject : Re: License Reform -- Novice/Young Enthusiasts

In article <2ffa8rINN540@abyss.west.sun.com>,
Dana Myers <myers@sunspot.West.Sun.COM> wrote:

>As for young people, I tend to think that making special allowances
>just to get young kids into ham radio is not a good idea.

Might I inquire why? Maybe we have different definitions of young.

Greg Young AC4YT
cheech@med.unc.edu

Date: 27 Dec 1993 05:52:31 GMT
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!concert!
bigblue.oit.unc.edu!cheech@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2facfk\$41dr@bigblue.oit.unc.edu>,
<1993Dec23.164509.18969@anomaly.sbs.com>, <1993Dec23.183522.24056@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Subject : Re: License reform (was Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

In article <1993Dec23.183522.24056@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
Gary Coffman <gary@ke4zv.UUCP> wrote:
>In article <1993Dec23.164509.18969@anomaly.sbs.com> kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev.
Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>>
>>On the other hand, how many kids really get into the hobby?
>
>I don't have numbers, but I'd be willing to bet that the number of
>hams under the age of 12 that are *active* hams could all meet in
>a small room. On the other hand, I think any high schooler should
>be able to pass the class A/B exam with a bit of work, and I'd expect
>a considerable number of bright 7th and 8th graders could do so as
>well. I've seen science fair projects by some of these kids, and they
>impress *me*.
>

In the club that I belong to there are two kids under 12 that are active.
Membership is about 70, giving around 3 percent. This may not be typical.
These two are frequently heard on the local repeaters, often talking about
what they've been doing on HF or packet. There are other kids with
licenses in the area, but I don't know how active they are.

Maybe we have different ideas on what the class A/B exam will be like. I
had imagined something more along the lines of the advanced exam, where I
actually had to think a little.

Greg Young AC4YT
cheech@med.unc.edu

Date: 27 Dec 1993 06:02:23 GMT
From: library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!paladin.american.edu!darwin.sura.net!
news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!concert!bigblue.oit.unc.edu!cheech@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Dec23.164509.18969@anomaly.sbs.com>,
<1993Dec23.183522.24056@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <1993Dec23.213231.22942@cs.brown.edu>
Subject : Re: License reform (was Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

In article <1993Dec23.213231.22942@cs.brown.edu>,
Michael P. Deignan <md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu> wrote:

>
>Certainly, I don't see why we should "dumb down" the tests as to make
>them easier. On the other hand, to make the plan politically saleable
>we may have to accomodate cries of "what about the kids!?!?" even though
>I've always said that people under the age of 16 are more likely to get
>involved with ham radio because dad is, not because they themselves found
>the hobby and took an interest in it.

Quite true, but it's also easier to get your hands on equipment is Dad is
a ham. If it's not his equipment to begin with, he is less inclined to
look at radios as just another expensive toy.

Greg Young AC4YT
cheech@med.unc.edu

Date: 27 Dec 1993 10:01:53 GMT
From: library.ucla.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!pipex!zaphod.crihan.fr!
jussieu.fr!univ-lille1.fr!ciril.fr!news.imag.fr!univ-lyon1.fr!
elendir@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Dec23.174015.23679@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
<2ffa8rINN540@abyss.west.sun.com>, <2flv1i\$cbi@bigblue.oit.unc.edu>yo
Subject : Re: License Reform -- Novice/Young Enthusiasts

Greg Young (cheech@med.unc.edu) wrote:
: In article <2ffa8rINN540@abyss.west.sun.com>,
: Dana Myers <myers@sunspot.West.Sun.COM> wrote:

: >As for young people, I tend to think that making special allowances
: >just to get young kids into ham radio is not a good idea.

: Might I inquire why? Maybe we have different definitions of young.

In the French system you must be at least 14 to get the beginner licenses and at least 16 for the full ones.

Vince.

--

Date: Sun, 26 Dec 1993 19:56:37 GMT
From: walter!dancer.cc.bellcore.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <gganderson.207.0@augustana.edu>,
<1993Dec23.174015.23679@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <2ffa8rINN540@abyss.West.Sun.COM>ot-
Subject : Re: License Reform -- Novice/Young Enthusiasts

In article <2ffa8rINN540@abyss.West.Sun.COM>,
Dana Myers <myers@sunspot.West.Sun.COM> wrote:
>In article <1993Dec23.174015.23679@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary
Coffman) writes:
>>In article <gganderson.207.0@augustana.edu> gganderson@augustana.edu (Kevin
Anderson -7325) writes:
>>>There needs to be novice levels to these. Whether things
>>>then become a 3 or 4 license structure can be argued. As the
>>>recent threads in r.r.a.misc have pointed out, there is
>>>lacking a means to allow or attract newer (whether young or old;
>>>I'm a newbie at 34) people into the hobby.
>>
>>I was afraid of this. Look we're trying to *simplify* the baroque
>>class structure of US licensing. That should *reduce* the hostility
>>and friction a newcomer faces from the current caste structure. That
>>alone would be an enormous boost.

While that's true, having an A, B & C (with C being a "junior license")
is certainly far simpler than today's system.

>>Anyone at least at the high school sophomore level of math and reading
>>comprehension should be able to pass the new written exam with a bit of
>>effort. It won't be harder than the old First Class Radiotelephone exam,
>>and I passed that at 14. Now that does imply that very young children,

Creation of a "Class C" junior license SHOULD target children as young
as the 6th grade. Why? Because they are our future, the hobby's future,
etc. Let's not create a new "Adults Only" hobby. The NOVICE license
was what got me on the air at 15. Had I learned about it earlier, odds

are I would have perhaps gotten the license at 13 or so.

As to the conclusion that "high school sophomore level math and reading comprehension" should get one through the "B" theory, that's fine IF you are a highschool sophomore or above. Let's not suddenly eliminate those that are not the 'academic elite" at 14 or 15. I would ONLY support the overall proposal as originally suggested if it does include a "junior" license. I do support the requirement that it be upgraded on or before one's 18th birthday.

>>like the 5 year old Novices we've read about, wouldn't be able to enter
>>amateur radio. Still we have to be careful not to dilute this proposal
>>too much. I'm not sure a child of 5 *should* be allowed to supervise
>>a 250 watt transmitter. It's not quite the same thing as handing them
>>a loaded gun or putting them behind the wheel of a car, but still we
>>have to believe that it should take some degree of maturity to be handed
>>unsupervised international communications capabilities. If we want a
>>learner's permit, it should probably be under the supervision of a
>>competent licensee. And we can do that now through third party
>>operations without involving the government.

Let's avoid the extreme's here. I think those of us that endorse a "junior" C Class license are not concerned with those rare 5 year old cases. Rather we want to be able to encourage, teach and help any AVERAGE kid between 12 and 18 to "get on the air" with their own call, if they have the interest. Operating as a third party isn't anywhere the same as making the QSO and receiving that QSL card addressed to yourself.

>As for young people, I tend to think that making special allowances
>just to get young kids into ham radio is not a good idea.

Simple question: WHY do you think that?

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #551

